

UNITED NATIONS

3663758



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

UN LIBRARY

THIRTY-FIRST YEAR

JUN 5 1985

UN/5-11-1985

1943rd MEETING: 14 JULY 1976

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1943)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Complaint by the Prime Minister of Mauritius, current Chairman of the Organization of African Unity, of the "act of aggression" by Israel against the Republic of Uganda:	
(a) Letter dated 6 July 1976 from the Assistant Executive Secretary of the Organization of African Unity to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12126);	
(b) Letter dated 6 July 1976 from the Permanent Representative of Mauritania to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12128);	
(c) Letter dated 4 July 1976 from the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/12123);	
(d) Letter dated 5 July 1976 from the Chargé d'affaires <i>a.i.</i> of the Permanent Mission of Uganda to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12124)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/...) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

1943rd MEETING

Held in New York, on Wednesday, 14 July 1976, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. Piero VINCI (Italy).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Benin, China, France, Guyana, Italy, Japan, Libyan Arab Republic, Pakistan, Panama, Romania, Sweden, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1943)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. Complaint by the Prime Minister of Mauritius, current Chairman of the Organization of African Unity, of the "act of aggression" by Israel against the Republic of Uganda:
 - (a) Letter dated 6 July 1976 from the Assistant Executive Secretary of the Organization of African Unity to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12126);
 - (b) Letter dated 6 July 1976 from the Permanent Representative of Mauritania to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12128);
 - (c) Letter dated 4 July 1976 from the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/12123);
 - (d) Letter dated 5 July 1976 from the Chargé d'affaires *a.i.* of the Permanent Mission of Uganda to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12124)

The meeting was called to order at 4.35 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Complaint by the Prime Minister of Mauritius, current chairman of the Organization of African Unity, of the "act of aggression" by Israel against the Republic of Uganda:

- (a) Letter dated 6 July 1976 from the Assistant Executive Secretary of the Organization of African Unity to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12126);
- (b) Letter dated 6 July 1976 from the Permanent Representative of Mauritania to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12128);

- (c) Letter dated 4 July 1976 from the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/12123);
- (d) Letter dated 5 July 1976 from the Chargé d'affaires *a.i.* of the Permanent Mission of Uganda to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12124)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions taken by the Council at its previous meetings [1939th to 1942nd meetings], I invite the representatives of the Federal Republic of Germany, Guinea, India, Israel, Kenya, Mauritania, Mauritius, Qatar, Somalia, Uganda, the United Republic of Cameroon and Yugoslavia to participate in the Council's discussion, without the right to vote.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Herzog (Israel), Sir Harold Walter (Mauritania) and Mr. Abdalla (Uganda) took places at the Council table; Mr. von Wechmar (Federal Republic of Germany), Mr. Camara (Guinea), M. Jaipal (India), Mr. Waiyaki (Kenya), Mr. El Hassen (Mauritania), Mr. Jamal (Qatar), Mr. Oyono (United Republic of Cameroon), Mr. Hussen (Somalia) and Mr. Mujezinović (Yugoslavia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the members of the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Cuba containing a request to be invited to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote. In accordance with the provisions of Article 31 of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite the representative of Cuba to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

3. I invite the representative of Cuba to take the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber, on the understanding that he will be invited to take a place at the Council table when it is his turn to speak.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Acosta (Cuba) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

4. Mr. KIKHIA (Libyan Arab Republic): First of all, Mr. President, I should like to join the other members of the Council and yourself in expressing our sincere condolences to the people and the Government of the

Federal Republic of Germany at the loss of an eminent national leader, Mr. Gustav Heinemann, an eminent international personality who was President of the Federal Republic of Germany from 1969 to 1974.

5. Today is 14 July, and on this occasion I should like to express my delegation's congratulations to the French delegation. We express the hope that France, traditionally the defender of freedoms, will join us hand in hand in fighting for progress, freedom and justice in the world and to demolish many other "Bastilles"—physical and spiritual—in our world that hinder the genuine progress of humanity towards a just and prosperous international community.

6. I shall not go into the details of what happened at Entebbe Airport in Uganda on 4 July. The Council has received full information concerning the Zionist aggression in the letter from Mr. Idi Amin, President of Uganda [S/12124]. Moreover, in his statement on Friday [1939th meeting], the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Uganda set forth all the details of this unprecedented crime. Also, the statements of the Foreign Minister of Mauritius, in his capacity as current Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity [1940th meeting]; the Permanent Representative of Mauritania, in his capacity as Chairman of the African Group [1939th meeting], and the Ambassador of Qatar, in his capacity as Chairman of the Arab Group [*ibid.*], have all shed more light on this tragic event.

7. We know that on 28 June President Amin was informed by Entebbe Airport Control that a hijacked plane with 250 passengers on board was seeking permission to land and that it had only 15 minutes' fuel left. The President and the people of Uganda were placed in a delicate dilemma—whether to refuse to allow the aircraft to land and thereby run the risk that the passengers would be killed, or to allow the aircraft to land and bear the consequences of the hijacking.

8. Motivated by humanitarian considerations and a sense of the responsibilities devolving upon him because of his position and in response to a request from France, the President of Uganda allowed the aircraft to land. Following that—and this was witnessed by the hostages, the French authorities and the crew of the hijacked plane—President Amin made sincere and untiring efforts to help the hostages and to save as much as he could in this delicate and very difficult situation. He communicated with the hijackers with a view to allowing the hostages to be served food and refreshments.

9. The Ugandan authorities had initially intended to supply the aircraft with food and fuel in order that it could proceed elsewhere. However, the hijackers refused to proceed to any other place. The Ugandan authorities were anxious to co-operate with them to ensure the safety of the hostages.

10. As previously explained by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Uganda, the hijackers placed explosives in strategic positions and demanded the withdrawal of Ugandan security forces to a position 200 metres away from the aircraft terminal building. They prevented the Ugandan forces from approaching the building. Our Ugandan brothers had no choice but to accept the demands of the hijackers.

11. Moreover, the hostages were provided with medical care, food and other necessary services and supplies. The French crew and many of the hostages have confirmed this fact, especially with regard to the medical team, consisting of doctors and nurses, that was made available to the hostages in need of medical attention.

12. Thanks to the efforts and persuasion of President Amin, a number of the hostages were released, especially those belonging to States other than Israel or having a dual nationality. President Amin frequently visited the hostages, reassuring them by confirming the untiring efforts he was making to secure their release. He received messages of appreciation and thanks from many Governments and from the hostages themselves for his sincere and humanitarian efforts.

13. At the same time, the Zionist authorities publicly announced their intention to negotiate with the hijackers. Last Friday, the representative of France confirmed to the Council that the Israeli authorities had contacted his Government to make known their intention of negotiating, with the French Government acting as intermediary.

14. But during this time the Zionist authorities were plotting their wanton aggression against Uganda. They were developing their plans and rehearsing the attack. In fact, from the very beginning, the Zionists intended to attack Uganda, using the hijacking incident as an excuse. Clearly, from the very beginning the Israeli Government was bent on attacking Uganda because it has not forgiven the heroic people and Government of Uganda for unmasking the ugly profile of Israel in Africa and its collaboration with the racist régimes in South Africa and Rhodesia. Mr. Rabin confirmed this strategy when he told the Knesset on 4 July: "The Israeli Defence Force and the intelligence community lost not a single hour required for thinking, planning and preparation." And yet, only three days before that announcement, the Israeli Foreign Minister had stated in the Knesset: "According to the information available to us, all the hostages are safe".

15. As I have previously stated, the Zionist entity is attempting to justify its aggression by this act of hijacking. It is trying, in vain, to present its naked aggression as a rescue operation, justified by international law and humanitarian motivations. It has attempted to accuse the President of Uganda and smear his name and the name of his country, claiming that he had been in collusion with the hijackers.

16. The Zionists are using their usual, traditional tactics of allegations, fabrications and lies in order to cover up the weakness of their arguments and the sinister character of their intentions. Their noisy propaganda is supported by their protectors, allies and lackeys, as well as by the powerful Western mass media and the colonialist, imperialist and capitalist newspapers.

17. Although this clearly was a flagrant attack against a sovereign State, a Member of this Organization, the Zionists have tried, in vain, to distract the attention of the international community from the aggression, which was in fact an act of treachery, felony and dishonesty. The Zionist invaders exploited the good faith of our Ugandan brothers and others, including the hijackers themselves, who trusted the word of honour given by the Zionist authorities. In fact, even *The New York Times* said on 11 July:

“the 707 informed the control tower in Entebbe that the Hercules aircraft were carrying the imprisoned guerrillas that the hijackers had demanded in exchange for the hostages”.

18. The Zionists had announced to the entire world their willingness to negotiate; and yet they approached the negotiating site with their weaponry. People trusted their word but, as their sinister record demonstrates so clearly, the notion of honour is unknown by the Zionist gangs.

19. In order to justify this ugly act of aggression, the Zionists not only have tried to accuse Uganda and its President, but have tried, in vain, to cast doubts on the behaviour of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), recognized by the United Nations and the majority of the world community as the legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. It is clear to the international community that the PLO denounced the hijacking from the outset and sent one of its most prominent representatives to Kampala in order to participate in the negotiations with the hijackers. Even the supporters of Israel—even the United States—have had occasion to express their appreciation to the PLO for its role in aiding in the evacuation of American citizens from other areas of the world. However, the hijackers, who were not under the control of the PLO, turned down its offers. Yet the Zionist representative has tried, in vain, to destroy the true image of the PLO as a serious, honest and decent national movement of liberation.

20. Israel's wanton aggression is a serious and grave crime against international law and its established rules and principles. It flouts the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter; it also constitutes a dangerous practice contrary to the principle of good faith in negotiations.

21. The crime committed by the Zionists will not serve the cause of peace, nor will it resolve the prob-

lems of hijacking or international terrorism, because international terrorism cannot be fought by State terrorism.

22. I will not indulge in lengthy quotations of abundant juridical and legal texts supporting my statement in this respect; I should like only to draw the attention of the Council to a very important and pertinent article appearing on 9 July in the French newspaper *Le Monde*, which is a respectable newspaper known all over the world, and which cannot be accused of being anti-semitic or pro-Arab. The Foreign Minister of Mauritius yesterday quoted some of this important article, written by Mr. Jean Schwoebel. I will quote some long passages of this article:

The United Nations Charter did not envisage the problems raised by terrorism and the taking of hostages, but States Members of the United Nations are bound by the basic principles which it proclaims, and which are the basis of peace and security in the world: no State shall mete out justice itself or interfere in the affairs of other States; and in any conflict States shall resort to peaceful methods and, if necessary, have recourse to the Security Council.

“The recognition of these principles has constituted enormous progress in relation to previous international law, which only attempted to ensure a precarious balance among the major Powers. It affords the small countries relatively effective protection to the extent that the great Powers, desirous of avoiding a new obviously suicidal war, have agreed to submit to certain common rules and even to a degree of control by the United Nations.

“... It is astonishing, if not disquieting, that not one of the Western leaders has expressed the slightest reservations concerning an act of force which was carried out unquestionably in violation of the Charter, and which has reintroduced the principle of ‘might makes right’ into international relations.

“The right of all States to protect their nationals, a right which some jurists have called ‘humanitarian protection’, has been invoked to justify a violation of Ugandan sovereignty. None the less, to leave the assessment of such a right to every State is not only contrary to the undertakings of United Nations Members, but also extremely dangerous. Moreover, it is forgotten that negotiations carried out by French diplomats were proceeding and had already produced not insignificant results; those negotiations had not been interrupted, as acknowledged by Paris when the Israelis carried out their raid on Entebbe. Mandated by all of the States concerned, France intended to pursue those negotiations to their conclusion, and would not have failed to determine responsibility, in case of failure.

“The Israelis have accused the Ugandan Chief of State of complicity with the terrorists who

hijacked the airbus, and in the Security Council it will be up to them to justify this accusation... It will not be easy for them, however, to substantiate it with clear and decisive proof. Although moral complicity with the terrorists on the part of Marshal Amin Dada is far from being excluded, it is accompanied by the fact of extreme prudence. Testimony in his favour is not lacking—particularly that of French diplomats, who have acknowledged that the Ugandan Chief of State had himself provided them with invaluable assistance. There is also the testimony of a number of hostages who expressed their appreciation to the Ugandan Chief of State for having contributed to easing their fate in Entebbe.”

“... The Israeli raid in Entebbe constitutes a no less serious danger that similar future actions may also be justified... Should it be recognized that the right of ‘humanitarian protection’ belongs only to militarily powerful States and can be exercised only against the weaker countries? In any case, it would be difficult to envisage that Israel would undertake the same sort of operation in Amsterdam or in Paris if, by chance, an aeroplane transporting Israelis that was hijacked by terrorists were to land at Schipol or Orly. The Canadian Minister for Foreign Affairs... frankly admitted... that Canada would not tolerate foreign intervention on its soil in the event of terrorist action.”

And he is right.

“Is it thus necessary, in order to combat terrorism, to resort to the law of the jungle and flout international law with not the slightest regard for the sovereignty of small States, even if they are black? For this is a flagrant violation of Ugandan sovereignty on the part of the Israelis. The Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Waldheim, formally stated as much upon his return from Mauritius...”

“ ‘Humanitarian protection’ has in the past been nothing but an alibi of the major Powers to justify their so-called gunboat diplomacy, a policy which, under the pretext of ensuring security and the defence of the rights and privileges of their nationals, enabled them to extend their colonial domination practically throughout the world. The Rhodesians and the South Africans, who uncorked the champagne upon learning of the success of the Israeli raid, were not mistaken. In any case, in that way they expressed their hope that the West, thus regaining its sense of mission and finally using its military superiority to the full, would decide at last to put an end to those egalitarian claims—which it considers abusive—on the part of the majority of developing countries and the domination which those countries now exercise in the United Nations.”*

* Quoted in French by the speaker.

23. Hijackers generally belong to politically motivated groups, and are therefore sometimes extremely idealistic in terms of their goals. In recent years, they have shown, in spite of their unacceptable and controversial behaviour, their trust in the spoken word and their willingness to negotiate. The criminal act committed by Israel will result in increased distrust by hijackers of the given word and of the feasibility of negotiation and compromise. Most certainly, the world will in future confront more cynical and more cautious hijackers, and the problem of hijacking and of international terrorism will never be solved.

24. In order to prove what I have said, I will quote once again from *The New York Times* of 11 July:

“The exchange of fire”—the article is describing what happened at Entebbe—“with the hijackers guarding the terminal was short but fierce. All but one of them apparently was cut down outside the terminal. Only Böse, the German, rushed inside, machine-gun in hand.

“For a hair-raising few seconds, the hijacker looked at his hostages sprawled in front of him. He could have killed many with a single burst from his gun. But, according to Mr. Har-Tuv, he paused, then shouted something like: ‘Retreat, get down’, and tuned the muzzle of his weapon on the approaching Israeli soldiers. A moment later, he was killed by a burst of Israeli fire.

“ ‘I couldn’t believe my eyes when I realized he wasn’t going to shoot us’, Mr. Har-Tuv said.”

25. I would also draw attention to a side point that is very important. The Israeli attack was based partly on information given by the released hostages, and this is very dangerous because in the future the hijacker will remember the lesson. We must think about this. It is very important because, as I said, this attack of Israel on Uganda will not stop the hijacking. It will not resolve the problem of hijacking.

26. The Arabs and Africans are really grateful to the Israeli Mafia for teaching us that fighting is no game. We are also grateful to them because now we realize the value of the Zionist promise and the Zionist engagements and negotiations. Everyone now understands the morals of the Zionists and the Israeli concept of negotiations. When they come to the United Nations and ask for negotiations with the Arabs, they intend to come to the negotiations with a dagger under their cloak.

27. I will not go into any details, as I said before, since previous speakers have covered many aspects of this tragedy, but I do want to deal with some aspects which my delegation feels are very important.

28. The entire world witnessed the jubilant celebrations by the Western Powers and their mass media,

as well as by the imperialist establishment, following the news of the Israeli aggression. They displayed a hysterical reaction, applauding the crime and hailing the aggression. A super-Power sent a message of support and congratulations to the Zionist entity for this "achievement". That Power expressed its congratulations to the Israeli establishment even before it had received all the details of what had occurred at Entebbe. Its radio, the Voice of America, diffused the news of the aggression only minutes after its occurrence. We expect such a reaction from this Power, which has always supported Israel and expressed its unlimited and unjust commitment to the Zionists' unjust cause. It is the same Power which has often expressed its hostility towards the struggle of the Arabs and Africans for their liberation and against the minority racist régimes in Palestine or in the southern part of Africa. This new manifestation of support for Israel and of hostility to the Africans and the Arabs follows its recent veto in the Security Council against the admission of the independent African country of Angola.

29. We have also noticed the general satisfaction in the West, and especially in the United Kingdom and in West Germany, regarding the Israeli aggression. Concerning the reaction of the racist régime in South Africa, I should like to refer to the newspaper, *Le Monde*, of 7 July 1976. It states, under the title "The proponents of white order are jubilant", the following:

"Mr. Vorster, Prime Minister of South Africa, addressed on Monday, 5 July, a congratulatory message to Mr. Rabin after the Israeli raid in Uganda. Several South African associations sent telegrams of support to the Government in Jerusalem.

"The success of the Israeli raid comforts the South African whites with the idea that the armies of black Africa cannot fight without assistance from outside and can be easily vanquished by white armies whose technology and spirit of initiative are superior.

"...

"The South African military are convinced that white Africa can easily be defended against black Africa. 'There is no real reason for concern except when a major Power such as the Soviet Union intervenes, either by a massive supply of military equipment or by sending troops or instructors' they say."*

30. The tragedy of Entebbe really revealed many distressing, dangerous and grave things. It revealed many dangers and grave psychological factors which still affect the Western establishment and the Western bourgeois society. I should like to draw attention to the following.

* Quoted in French by the speaker.

31. First, the Western Powers have manifested a racist and fanatic solidarity with the white minority settlement in Palestine. For them, the Israeli aggression merely demonstrated a highly successful operation performed by the white man against the blacks of Africa and against the browns of the Arab lands—against the blacks and the browns of another and hostile world, that of the Arab-African community. Also, the jubilation of the Western world corresponds with their obsession with technical efficiency and technical success—even at the sacrifice of decency, honesty, honour and moral principles. The Israeli attack revived in Europe the old colonial dreams. It was viewed by some of the mass media of Europe as a rebirth of the old European virility and vigour, as well as a nostalgic reminder of the good days of Europe.

32. Secondly, the role of the racist Zionist entity as an instrument to serve and protect the imperialist and capitalist interests in the region and in the area has been confirmed. Israel wants the Western Powers to give it the green light to perform the role of policeman in our region in order to keep the peoples and the resources of the African and Arab community under control in co-operation with the racist white régimes in South Africa and Rhodesia. It is an historical fact that the Zionist movement has from the outset offered itself as a servant of the imperialist and capitalist interests in our land.

33. Thirdly, one important goal of the Israeli aggression was to demoralize the Africans and to demoralize the Arabs, to encourage division among them and to convince them that their struggle against the racist colonialist white settlers will achieve nothing in Palestine or in South Africa. The Israelis want to convince us that a concentrated drive against the white minority racist régimes is hopeless, is a lost cause, and that the only alternative for us is a return to subservience, under our old masters. In this regard, the weekly *Manchester Guardian* of 11 July said:

"... throughout Africa... there must also be a new feeling of military vulnerability. If three Israeli planes, lumbering out of a clear blue sky, can demolish half Uganda's costly MIGs on the tarmac and rout an army in entrenched positions, then some of the pretence of African armed might... is stripped away. How safe is Lusaka or Dar or Nairobi from a sudden technological strike? And what perceptions of, say, the Southern Africa crisis may be altered by such knowledge?"

The Washington Post articulated this idea in one of its recent headlines: "Israel's raid underlines the helplessness of the African States".

34. Fourthly, the Israeli aggression underlined the danger of the commitment of a super-Power to an aggressive and racist régime like the Zionist entity. The aggression was made possible by American-made

aircraft, American sophisticated equipment, American technology and American know-how, in addition to American encouragement and patronage. We know that American law proscribes and prevents the use of military equipment delivered or sold to foreign Governments for any purpose other than international security or self defence. On this occasion I should like to observe that even the American press could not ignore this embarrassing aspect of the problem concerning the American involvement. Today, *The Washington Post* says:

“The State Department has concluded that there was ‘no violation’ of American law in Israel’s use of US-manufactured C-130 military aircraft in the spectacular commando raid into Uganda on July 3-4.

“The conclusion surprised no one, especially after President Ford quickly commended Israel for rescuing 103 hostages held at a Ugandan airport. The significance of the State Department ruling—and the firm position of the United States in the United Nations on the raid—is the precedent it can establish, US officials concede.

“In the case of US law on arms sales, the State Department, in effect, took a swift route out of the questioned use of weapons sold to Israel with legal strings on them. This law requires such arms to be used only for internal security, self-defence, regional defence, or measures consistent with the UN Charter.

“The department rules that Israel had used the three C-130 American transports in Uganda for ‘legitimate self-defence’ permitted under the Foreign Military Sales Act. This was an unusual application of self-defence terminology, because the raid took place 2,500 miles from Israeli territory.

“An even more novel American legal interpretation was the one presented at the UN Security Council on Monday, US officials acknowledged.”

We see from this article the sting of conscience the Americans feel about this problem.

35. When the Zionist entity executed its flight from occupied Palestine to the heart of Africa, did that involve a case of self-defence or a case of internal security? We ask America to address itself to this question. We realize, however, that our appeals and questions to America have repeatedly fallen on deaf ears. We do not expect any response, especially during this election year, a time when the Zionists can make or break American politicians. However, we still address our appeals and our legitimate inquiries to the American people. In time, that great people will discover the gross Zionist conspiracy against its country and against its own vital interests. One day, the American people will discover the true cata-

strophic dimensions of the unlimited American commitment to the Zionist racist entity and to the Zionist movement. We still have faith in people, we do not despair of people. Our quarrel is with the American establishment and with the Zionist movement and the Zionist gangs who still are influencing American policy.

36. Permit me now to make some short personal comments.

37. It is really most distressing to notice that Mr. Scranton recognizes a breach of the territorial integrity of Uganda, and that that breach is “impermissible under the Charter of the United Nations” [1941st meeting, para. 77] but that he nevertheless applauds the Israeli aggression as

“one of the most remarkable rescue missions in history, a combination of guts and brains that has seldom, if ever, been surpassed. It electrified millions everywhere, and I confess I was one of them.” [Ibid., para. 95.]

I deplore this confession from our colleague Mr. Scranton. I deplore this passionate and irrelevant reaction from a man whom we have always appreciated for his calm, his decency and his elegant manner. I confess that all of us, during these months of working together in this Council, have greatly respected Mr. Scranton as a loyal son of the American nation, even though we have differed with him and his Government on political issues. I register my disappointment and astonishment at such a statement. However, we may find an explanation for such a reaction by placing this irrational and sentimental eruption provoked by the criminal attack at Entebbe, against the kind of racial, if not racist, background still entrenched in the Western bourgeois society.

38. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of France. Before calling upon him, I should like to take this opportunity to offer him, on behalf of all members of the Council and on behalf of my delegation, our warmest congratulations on the national holiday of his country. The date of 14 July is one of profound and lasting significance in the history of the liberty of peoples and the affirmation of human rights, and it seems to me important to mention it in this debate, in the course of which the matters of the independence and sovereignty of peoples and of fundamental human rights have occupied such an important place.

39. Mr. LECOMPT (France) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, I wish first of all to thank you for the kind words you have addressed to my country. You have, I believe, so well defined the ideals that inspired the French Revolution, which began on 14 July, that I can add nothing to what you said except to offer, even though this is my national holiday, to make my contribution to our labours.

40. My delegation would first of all like to convey here to the delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany its condolences on the death of President Gustav Heinemann. France had indeed profound esteem for the breadth of vision, the political courage and the total loyalty of Mr. Heinemann, who was a colleague and friend of President Pompidou and whose role in the friendly co-operation between our countries was considerable. We feel as our own the cruel loss just sustained by the Federal Republic of Germany. I myself had the honour of knowing Mr. Heinemann. I had high regard for the human warmth of his approach, and I would add my own personal condolences to those of my delegation.

41. By reason of its tragic consequences, the hijacking of the French airbus operating on the Tel Aviv-Paris line to the airport at Entebbe, Uganda, illustrates one of the most serious dangers to which the international community is exposed. The French delegation, therefore, although it has various reasons for sharing the feelings aroused by this incident in France and elsewhere, believes that we should approach our examination of the incident without passion and, as far as possible, within the framework of principles.

42. My delegation has already given detailed testimony concerning the course of events. It is therefore not necessary to review the facts, except to recall that their sequence, right up to the violent dénouement, makes it difficult to attribute responsibility. As, however, we should respond to the questions raised in the Council, even though, in our view, they disguise the real problem, I shall confine myself, on this point, to a few brief comments.

43. Let us first take Israel, the subject of the complaint by several African countries. At first sight there would not seem to be any doubt that the surprise attack by an armed force on a foreign airport for the purpose of achieving an objective by violence indeed constituted a violation of international law. However, in order to make an objective judgement, we should take into account the circumstances that led up to this action. Obviously, the incident would not have taken place if there had not been beforehand an unlawful threat to the lives and security of innocent persons. The Israeli intervention had the purpose and the effect of freeing certain Israeli citizens who, together with French citizens, were being subjected to the most detestable kind of blackmail, that in which the victim is threatened with immediate death and deprived of the slightest influence over arbitrarily determined events and factors which, when they come into play, in one way or another determine his life or his death.

44. Some claim that the Israeli action was unnecessary because the negotiation with the hijackers was on the point of success. But, apart from the fact that it is impossible after the event to be sure that such an optimistic assessment is justified, it should be realized that such reasoning implicitly legitimizes blackmail

because it is the blackmail alone which set in train the negotiation, one of the parties to which belongs to none of the categories known to international law.

45. These considerations illustrate the tremendous difficulty of categorizing the action undertaken by Israel. If there was a violation of the sovereignty of Uganda, it was not in order to infringe the territorial integrity or the independence of that country but exclusively to save endangered human lives, and this in an extremely particular and special situation. One could well invoke here article 2 of the Definition of Aggression annexed to General Assembly resolution 3314 (XXIX), which deals with what is "*prima facie*" an act of aggression and says that it is permissible to judge it "in the light of other relevant circumstances".

46. It is equally difficult to render a judgement on the conduct of Uganda. Article 9 of the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft, signed at The Hague on 16 December 1970,¹ to which Uganda acceded on 27 March 1972, provides that when the hijacking of an aircraft has occurred or is about to occur, "Contracting States shall take all appropriate measures to restore control of the aircraft to its lawful commander or to preserve his control of the aircraft." But who could blame Uganda for having thought first of all of the life of the passengers and the crew and having taken measures to ensure their security, to give them a minimum of comfort and to facilitate the freeing of most of them, even if such conduct might in the final analysis make it more likely that the unlawful demands of the hijackers would be met?

47. In my first statement [1939th meeting] I gave a clear explanation with regard to the events which followed the decision of the Government of Uganda. I gave an account of the relations which from that point on and with regard to the facts of which we at that time had knowledge were established between the Ugandan authorities and the hijackers.

48. Does the concern aroused by this affair warrant a further inquiry? In truth, it does not seem to us that a measure of this kind could shed much more light as long as we are confined to the question of the responsibility of the States involved in the drama at Entebbe. The concern, the difficulty stem from the fact that these States are, in spite of their apparent opposition, linked together in the consequences of the inexorable chain of events triggered off by the same evil—aerial hijacking accompanied by the taking of hostages.

49. This affair is typical in this respect. It demonstrates to what degree the initiative of a group of individuals bent on carrying through their criminal intentions if their demands are not met, whatever their motives, can affect international relations. The initial violence committed by persons who are not subject of international law against persons who themselves enjoy no representative quality leads to a torrent of irregularities and illegalities which, this time, are the

work of States and culminate in another act of violence. The consequences of this concatenation of events are deplorable in terms of the loss of human life, the anguish caused to the hostages and their families, and material damage or in terms of the undermining in relations between States of the stability and confidence necessary for peace.

50. Of course the perpetrators of these acts would maintain that they are waging a struggle in the service of a cause and, because they do not possess the resources of a State, they are waging war in the best way they can, attempting to achieve the best results at the lowest cost. The invoking of such motives cannot provide the least justification. Apart from the fact that there is no authority competent to judge of the legitimacy of an action undertaken in such circumstances, the nature of the motives cannot justify recourse to such means. The international community is making slow progress towards the elimination of war, it cannot allow groups to have recourse, in the service of their cause, to means which are all the more repugnant because they endanger only innocent lives. Furthermore, there are forms of violence which actually harm the cause which they are meant to serve. The disavowal at the very outset by the PLO and the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine of the action of the hijackers of the airbus derives from a correct understanding of the true interests of the Palestinians.

51. France, here and elsewhere, has never failed to recall the need for a negotiated settlement of the Middle East problem on the threefold basis of the withdrawal from occupied territories, recognition of the right of the Palestinian people to a homeland and the right of all the countries of the area to live in peace within secure, recognized and guaranteed frontiers. These acts of violence on both sides, by creating new sources of friction, distrust and resentment, unfortunately do nothing to bring such a desirable settlement any closer.

52. My country has always deplored violence from whatever quarter. It deplores it again today with regard to the tragedy which has unfortunately caused deaths on both sides. France is also very much concerned at the consequences of this kind of tragedy for international relations when, as has just been the case, a choice arises between the saving of human life and respect for national sovereignty. If we are to draw a conclusion from the tragic affair at Entebbe, it is that we must do everything in our power by means of negotiation to ensure that the lawful rights of everyone are recognized. The right to life of innocent persons transported in aircraft is by no means the least legitimate; it is obvious and it is sacred. It is becoming urgent to seek in this area, as in other areas, ways of enabling countries to work together on this more actively and more effectively.

53. The PRESIDENT: Since all members of the Council have spoken on the item under consideration,

I shall now, in accordance with a long-established practice, make a statement in my capacity as representative of ITALY.

54. Let me confess at the very outset that as I begin my statement in this debate, I am overtaken by mixed feelings and above all by a deep sense of anxiety. Sitting in the Chair and having the advantage, or disadvantage—I really do not know which—of being the last speaker among the members of the Council, I could not fail to sense the strong undercurrent of emotion running through each statement made in this debate. And I find it hard to divest myself altogether of the current responsibilities of the presidency and the consequent duties of impartiality which are expected of me. I shall certainly do my best to meet those expectations. I shall leave it to my colleagues round this table to judge whether, in the views I shall express, I have been inspired more by my temporary higher responsibilities than by my responsibilities as representative of my country. I personally believe that the two sets of views are nearly, if not entirely, identical.

55. The African delegations, in a show of solidarity which is quite understandable and which I, for one, fully respect, have forcefully upheld the unconditional inviolability of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of a Member State, strongly rejecting any attempt to weaken or tone down the condemnation or deploring of the Israeli raid on the Entebbe international airport because of extenuating circumstances. Behind that firm position there is, if I well understand it, one main concern generally shared by our African friends—namely, that once such action is condoned or ignored, it will be easier to return to the so-called gunboat policy, leaving small, defenceless States to the mercy of neighbouring or distant Powers. That is indeed a legitimate concern and nobody could quarrel with it. And, in all fairness and in spite of some contrary views expressed, understandably, in the heat of the debate, it must be acknowledged that, as the verbatim records show very clearly, no member of this Council has taken this concern lightly.

56. On the other hand, Israel and other delegations have strongly upheld the right or the duty of a Government to use appropriate means, including limited and localized use of force, to protect the lives of its endangered nationals in the territory of another State when the latter has proved unable to ensure such protection. In this respect, different views have been put forward during the debate, each being supported by the citation of prominent jurists or of the Charter of the United Nations. There seems to be little ground for agreement on this point, also because this Council, notwithstanding the outstanding juridical background of some of its members, is essentially a political body and not an appropriate forum to settle such a delicate question. The problem, however, cannot be ignored, in my view, and I wonder if we could not agree at least on having it referred to the International Law

Commission in order to lay the groundwork for the adoption of a universally accepted doctrine on the matter and avoid, at least for the future, a repetition of the differences which have emerged in this debate.

57. Against those motivations of a predominantly human and juridical nature stands, however, the indisputable right of each Member State to full respect for its sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity. Here again, I believe, no one questions the fact that crossing the frontiers or the territorial air space of an independent nation like Uganda without permission or previous notice is an infringement of its sovereignty.

58. Even on that controversial point, however, it seems to me that an element of consensus has emerged. It was mentioned in most eloquent terms by the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania, and I prefer to use his words:

“So far as the sanctity of human life is concerned, we have made it clear before, and I want to make it clear again, that to my Government and my people, no less than to myself personally, life is sacrosanct; the loss of human life is to be regretted, whether it be Jewish life, African life, Arab life or any other type of life. Human life must be preserved, human life must be protected, and every step must be taken to ensure the preservation of that life.”
[1942nd meeting, para. 180.]

59. Even if there may be differences of opinion as to the conclusions to be drawn from this principle, there is one point on which we all agree: the right to life is sacrosanct, irrespective of race, nationality, religion or political affiliation, and the reaffirmation of the need for unconditional respect of it should be the paramount concern of the Council.

60. And that brings me to the third aspect of the events we have been considering—an aspect which some delegations put in the forefront of their statements and others in the background, but which no delegation had deemed it possible to ignore and which has been unanimously condemned. The Foreign Minister of Mauritius, speaking in his capacity of current Chairman of the Organization of African Unity, had made this point in very clear terms. I am referring to the phenomenon of terrorism, in particular of international terrorism and air piracy, which has grown in recent years to unprecedented dimensions and represents an actual threat of disruption of the air transportation system and disintegration of the normal structures of our societies as well.

61. Now, while I fully agree with Ambassador Salim that principles must have priority over any other consideration, I feel it is my duty to put some questions to the Council which I believe are pertinent. Is it not true that in order to uphold the main principles enshrined in the Charter and achieve their implementa-

tion, it is not enough to speak in favour of them? What is required is action to fulfil these principles. In other words, if no practical action is taken by the world community to implement some agreed-upon rules consistent with those principles to prevent nations, groups or individuals from violating the principles, what other choice is left to the countries victims of these violations than to take the defence of law into their own hands? The history of mankind shows that this was the case in the dark ages, when individuals or States took up the right to make justice wherever the State authorities or the international community were unable to do so or impotent. That is the challenge we are facing today. Either we let—to use a somewhat colorful expression—the new Dostoyevsky demons at present acting in our national societies and in the international community take over and disintegrate our civilization, replacing order by chaos, or we react jointly with appropriate means. I do not underestimate the sacrifice which each country is called upon to make—not in basic principles, but in its individual positions and interests. The main requirement, at this crucial juncture for the future of our people and that of the world community, which are closely intertwined, is to rise above our individual interests and positions, giving priority to the common interest of mankind, which affects equally each State Member of the United Nations. That is not easy, I know—the more so since I am fully aware of the deep-rooted causes that have produced these disruptive phenomena of international terrorism, and in particular air terrorism.

62. The representative of Guinea has kindly quoted [1940th meeting, para. 28] what I stated in this connexion in the Sixth Committee at the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly. May I add to this quotation some other points reproduced in the official summary records of meetings held between 20 September and 12 December 1972. That was four years ago. I quote:

“Italy is primarily concerned, for the time being, with purely criminal cases of terrorism and those manifestations of political terrorism which occur outside the immediate area of existing political conflicts and affect the interests of States not parties to such conflicts. Acts of violence directed against innocent persons or innocent countries undermine the very foundations of international order; hence my delegation gives a high priority to the elaboration of an international convention designed to curb international terrorism.”²

And I suggested seven points to be included in a recommendation to the General Assembly.

63. That was the position of my Government in 1972, and still is; and we think that this is highly regrettable, because it means that the international community has failed so far to find a remedy to both aspects of the situation I mentioned at the time. Major problems, such as that of the Middle East, the very existence

of which increases international tensions and is used by irresponsible persons to give political and patriotic justification to their criminal actions, are still far from solution. And moreover, the world community has been unable to fill the unacceptable loopholes existing in the system of international law in the field of prevention and suppression of these crimes.

64. Previous efforts, which produced among other regulations, the Conventions of Tokyo,³ The Hague¹ and Montreal,⁴ have achieved little result in the struggle against terrorism. These partial failures should be used as a lesson to work out new and more effective instruments allowing the international community to overcome its present state of impotence. This is exactly what the nine members of the European Community had in mind long before the hijacking of the French civilian aircraft on its way from Tel Aviv. Accordingly, they took the decision yesterday, in one of their periodic meetings at the level of Heads of State or Government, to elaborate among themselves a treaty containing more coercive measures to eradicate and prevent international terrorism, kidnappings and hijackings.

65. The United Nations, as a universal organization intended to promote peace and progress in the world, is certainly the most appropriate forum in which to elaborate similar instruments on a global scale.

66. Any further delay in taking urgent action in order to reverse the trend of events and to prevent and suppress international terrorism would deprive us of the only effective deterrent against two equal threats: first, the use of force at the expense of defenceless or weak countries, involved against their will in the detention of hostages by terrorists; secondly, the spreading and strengthening of irrational criminal groups which are at work inside our national societies and in the international community to bring about the end of our civilization.

67. The Council, rising to the occasion, has a unique opportunity: on the one hand, firmly to uphold the principle of unconditional respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all States, and, on the other hand, to promote the proposed action, the follow-up of which should be undertaken within the competent organs of the United Nations. These two objectives, if I understand correctly, are exactly what the Secretary-General had in mind when, at the end of the statement he made to the Council on 9 July he advocated:

“Let me conclude by expressing the hope that, despite the strong views which will undoubtedly be expressed in the debate, the Council will find a way to point the world community in a constructive direction so that we may be spared a repetition of the human tragedies of the past and the type of conflict between States which the Council will now be considering.” [1939th meeting, para. 16.]

68. Mr. KHARLAMOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): Mr. President, I will be brief. I should like to say a few words in connexion with your own statement.

69. You, as representative of Italy, categorically condemned international terrorism. You said you were in favour of taking effective measures to prevent such actions in the future, and you advocated the severe punishment of those who undertake such actions.

70. In this regard, I should like to draw your attention, and that of the members of the Council, to a report published on 12 July in *The New York Times*, which reveals that your country gave shelter to two terrorists who, in the course of a hijacking, killed the stewardess of a Soviet aircraft and wounded two pilots of the aircraft. They spent some time in Turkey, after which they found refuge in your country.

71. Now, how can we reconcile this with your statement about the need for the punishment of the criminals? And we are talking here not of a political crime but of a regular criminal offence, an assassination. We heard yesterday of a woman whose fate was unknown. Now, in the case of the stewardess, the fate of that woman is known: she tried to protect the passengers, but those criminals killed her, and your country, Sir, is harbouring the criminals, according to *The New York Times* of 12 July.

72. Now, how are we to reconcile your personal condemnation, Mr. President, with the action which is reported in *The New York Times*? Perhaps you could give us an explanation of this.

73. The PRESIDENT: Speaking as the representative of ITALY, may I say, in reply to the representative of the Soviet Union, that I am not aware of the incident he has mentioned but I shall make an inquiry. In any event, at this stage, if I were he, I would not take for granted what is reported in any article, even an article in one of the most prominent newspapers in the world, *The New York Times*.

74. Mr. BENNETT (United States of America): This is merely a brief comment on a rather peripheral subject which was raised, as he said, in a personal capacity by the representative of Libya.

75. I appreciate the sympathy and regard expressed by the Libyan representative for Mr. Scranton, and I am sure Mr. Scranton would wish to reciprocate. But I am distressed at the Libyan representative's expressed disappointment at some of Mr. Scranton's statement, which he then proceeded to quote, but which he quoted only in part. Now, since the Libyan representative is fluent in both French and English, I think he might have read the English text a little more carefully. Perhaps then he would not have been so disappointed, although even then he might not have agreed with it.

76. In short, I cannot accept the situation in which the Libyan representative quotes only part of Mr. Scranton's remarks and thus misquotes them and makes a false point. Since I would not want to believe that the Libyan representative would wilfully misquote Mr. Scranton, perhaps I can best serve the interests of the Council by reading out the full text of the pertinent portion of those remarks. I quote from Mr. Scranton's statement of 12 July: "Israel's action is rescuing the hostages necessarily involved a temporary breach of the territorial integrity of Uganda." [1941st meeting, para. 77]. Now the Libyan representative makes much of that concession, which is a statement of fact. We have all agreed here that there was a breach of territorial integrity, but he departed there, and this is how Mr. Scranton went on:

"Normally, such a breach would be impermissible under the Charter of the United Nations. However, there is a well established right to use limited force for the protection of one's own nationals from an imminent threat of injury or death in a situation where the State in whose territory they are located is either unwilling or unable to protect them. The right, flowing from the right of self-defence, is limited to such use of force as is necessary and appropriate to protect threatened nationals from injury.

"The requirements of this right to protect nationals were clearly met in the Entebbe case." [Ibid., paras. 77 and 78.]

77. The PRESIDENT: There are some other representatives who have asked to speak. The first is the representative of Cuba, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

78. Mr. ACOSTA (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, the Cuban delegation is extremely pleased to see you presiding over the proceedings of the Council. This satisfaction is all the greater because Italy and Cuba maintain the most cordial relations to our mutual advantage. I should like to thank you and through you the other members of the Council for having allowed Cuba to participate in the debate.

79. We should like to express our condolences to the People's Republic of China on the death of Marshal Chou-teh, Chairman of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress of the People's Republic of China and to the Federal Republic of Germany on the death of Mr. Gustav Heinemann, former President of that country.

80. With regard to the item under discussion, my delegation believes that at this stage of the debate it would be futile to go into a detailed account of the events at Entebbe and the background to them. Some of the speakers who have preceded me have made it unnecessary for me to undertake that task.

81. It is the view of the Cuban delegation that the action of Israel at the Entebbe airport on 4 July last unquestionably constitutes a flagrant violation of the basic provisions of the United Nations Charter. The criminal violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of an independent and non-aligned country, a Member State of the United Nations can in no way be justified and constitutes an intolerable outrage to international peace and security.

82. A number of delegations here have tried to distort the item before the Council by putting forward fallacious arguments and misinterpretations of law. A patently aggressive and bloody act has been acclaimed and some have attempted to justify it.

83. The Charter contradicts any twisted interpretation that some might attempt to give to this act. This can be seen from Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter, which states that:

"All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations."

84. In the light of this article, my delegation would like to ask the members of the Council: Has Uganda resorted to the threat or use of force against Israel? Has Uganda threatened the territorial integrity or independence of the Tel Aviv régime?

85. The reply is clear, simple and obvious. Uganda was simply trying to find a solution for the predicament of the passengers, who had been brought by force into its territory. Uganda, in a humanitarian gesture, agreed to the landing of the French airbus when it had barely enough fuel for a 15-minute flight. In response to this gesture, it was the victim of a surprise attack which took the lives of many of its sons and caused it considerable material losses.

86. This action is consistent with the traditionally aggressive and racist policy of the Government of Israel, on which the United Nations and international public opinion have a voluminous and alarming file of information.

87. Of course, we are not surprised that some delegations have claimed an alleged right to the use of armed force to protect the nationals of a country on foreign territory. This has been the traditional excuse used by the imperialists to commit all sorts of misdeeds throughout the world. Latin America has deep scars as a result of such a concept. Now, with the events at Entebbe, they claim justification for the big stick policy in Africa as well.

88. My delegation has no doubt that acts of terrorism are a threat to the lives of innocent civilians and are reprehensible. But the same can be said of the official

terrorism practiced by Israel against a country whose Government became involved unintentionally in a difficult conflict. This, Israel's act of aggression against Uganda, is the item on the Council's agenda.

89. My delegation asks the Council to condemn the violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Uganda by Israel and to demand that Israel compensate Uganda for the damage caused.

90. The events of 4 July are, furthermore, a warning to all non-aligned countries, and a call for the unity of Africa, an Africa which defends the fine and noble future to which its sons are entitled.

91. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of the Democratic Republic of Somalia. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

92. Mr. HUSSEN (Somalia): May I first of all associate myself with those who have preceded me in expressing sincere condolences to the delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany on the untimely death of Mr. Gustav Heinemann, the former President of the Federal Republic of Germany.

93. The Council is today seized of a question that, in our view, touches upon the fundamental reasons for which this organization was founded. That question is the unprecedented illegal and condemnable act of aggression against the territorial integrity and sovereignty of a Member State. It is the only item on the agenda, and we had hoped that the Council would confine its attention to it. We see no reason why this item should be diluted by the slanderous accusations that have been directed against Member States which rightfully believe that the lofty principle of safeguarding and upholding the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all nations, irrespective of their size and power, must be respected and preserved.

94. The accusation made by the representative of Israel in the Council yesterday when he said that Somalia was a threat to neighbouring States is characteristic of the policy which his Government has pursued over the years in an attempt to cause misunderstandings and to undermine African unity so that Israeli interests may best be served.

95. The African States have not been slow to recognize that policy. It is a fact that the overwhelming majority of them have severed relations with Israel and have rejected its offers of financial and economic assistance, knowing from their experience that such assistance is a device to compromise their independence and sovereignty. The African States have not been slow to recognize the collusion of Israel with the Pretoria régime with a view to perpetuating the subjugation of the African people in South Africa.

96. It is ironic that Israel, which was born of and nourished on terrorism, should now be so shameless

as to accuse other States of being centres of terrorism. What country is there today which can parallel Israel's record of brutality and aggression against a defenceless population? What country has ordered the systematic aerial bombardment of defenceless villages and camps, if not Israel?

97. I could go on and recite a long history of Israel's atrocities against its neighbours, but if I did so I would fall into the trap which Israel and its supporters would like us to fall into. I shall not do so. The purpose of this debate is not to discuss terrorism. It is not to discuss relations between States. It is to discuss Israel's flagrant aggression against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Uganda.

98. It is a matter of regret that those members who have confined their remarks to questions of terrorism have not extended a word of sympathy to the innocents who died at the hands of the Israeli commandos at Entebbe Airport. The consequences of the Entebbe incident may prove it to be a Pyrrhic victory for the Israeli Government. I say this because if there should be another unfortunate hijacking incident, the Israeli Government and those who collaborated with it in this matter may well find their credibility so impaired by the present incident that negotiations are made almost impossible.

99. The Somali Ambassador served as an intermediary in the Entebbe incident not because of political considerations but because of the humanitarian responsibilities which devolve upon him as dean of the Arab Group of ambassadors accredited to the Republic of Uganda. His services, which were greatly appreciated by those who were actively involved in the conduct of the negotiations, led to the release of a great many of the hostages. If he had refused to take on those responsibilities, what would the civilized community have said? Are we to understand from what the Israeli representative has said in the Council that countries involved in such negotiations are conspirators?

100. The factors involved in the Entebbe incident, and also their ramifications, deserve the most serious consideration of the Council before a final decision on the subject is taken.

101. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Uganda. I now call upon him.

102. Mr. ABDALLA (Uganda): Mr. President, on behalf of the delegation of Uganda, I wish to thank you for the way you have guided the work of the Council. I wish also to express my sincere thanks to all the delegations that have made valuable contributions to the discussion.

103. No matter what the Zionist representative said when addressing this Council on Friday last [*1939th meeting*], the fact remains that Zionist Israel stands

accused in the dock for committing a serious crime of wanton aggression against innocent Ugandans who were making every effort to save all the hostages. It is therefore altogether incredible that Uganda should stand accused and that the Israeli representative should try to make this Council believe that Uganda collaborated with the hijackers.

104. The only issue before the Council is the Israeli act of aggression against Uganda. The Council should therefore unanimously condemn Israel for its aggression and, at the same time, demand from Israel compensation for the lives of the people killed and wounded and the property destroyed during the invasion. The Israeli representative produced no convincing evidence to support Israel's case. All that was said by the Israeli representative consisted of nothing other than a pack of lies calculated to divert the attention of the Council from the real issue before it, namely, the Israeli act of aggression against Uganda concerning which this meeting was called.

105. Instead of being grateful to Uganda for having saved the lives of the hostages, Israel invaded Uganda. The Council has been told that Israel is proud of what it did in Uganda and that it is not even ashamed of publicly asserting that it would do it again. The Council should view the conduct of Israel in Uganda as amounting to the conduct of a thief. Israel is like a thief who breaks into your house at night, kills the people therein and destroys property with impunity and afterwards boasts before the whole world that he is strong.

106. It is true, Uganda was invaded. But it is not the first time in modern history that such a thing has happened. Perhaps one need not go further than to cite one modern incident, namely that of Pearl Harbor, when American warships were completely wiped out by the Japanese forces during the Second World War. The world could not believe that story. Yet it was true that America had fallen victim to a surprise attack. Did this in any way mean that America was weak, militarily speaking? Or did it mean that the United States military capability was at an end?

107. The circumstances surrounding the invasion of Uganda should therefore be looked at in that light. At the time of the invasion, the Government of Uganda had placed only a handful of soldiers at the old Entebbe Airport, just one platoon to guard the area. Also, they were armed only with rifles and nothing else. This was done in order not to scare the hijackers, which would seriously have endangered the lives of the hostages. It is also true that before the invasion Uganda was negotiating in good faith with Israel, while Israel was all along preparing and rehearsing its naked act of aggression against Uganda. Uganda was deceived. But this will not happen again. I wish to assure the Council that Uganda is strong and that our armed forces are more capable than ever of repulsing any would-be aggressor, be it Israel or any other country.

108. We urge the Council to concentrate its attention on the Israeli act of aggression against Uganda, and nothing else. When you have considered it, we ask you to condemn it unreservedly.

109. As you know, the President of the Republic of Uganda did his utmost to have all the hostages released, and this he did in the interest of humanity. As you are already aware, most of the hostages had been released at the time of the invasion without a single loss of life. Israel, instead of appreciating this fact, went ahead and invaded Uganda, and this resulted in serious destruction of both life and property. One lesson that ought to be drawn from this is that few States, in the future, will be willing to go out of their way to save the lives of potential victims of hijacking, in view of Israel's action against Uganda.

110. The Israeli representative has told this Council that the PLO maintains an office in Kampala, Uganda. If this is so, it should surprise nobody, since the PLO has observer status here at the United Nations. Any country can have relations with the PLO. Even here in New York the PLO has an office.

111. On Friday, the Council was told that Israel invaded Uganda because Uganda, allegedly, was guilty of an offence of piracy *jure gentium*, that is piracy against the whole world. In other words, Uganda's action was assimilated to piracy on the high seas. When Israel committed the aggression against Uganda, not only did it take hostages out, as Israel says it intended to do, but it also killed many innocent people and wantonly destroyed a considerable amount of our property, including a number of expensive aircraft. Now, which of the two is a pirate? Is it Uganda or is it Israel? This I will leave the Council to decide.

112. The other argument advanced was that Israel invaded Uganda in exercise of its inherent right of self-defence as laid down in Article 51 of the Charter. The Israeli representative laboured this point at great length, quoting many examples which in fact were irrelevant to the issue and merely calculated to divert the attention of the Council from the problem which is before it, namely, the Israeli act of aggression against Uganda. This premeditated aggression against Uganda was nothing other than a violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of an independent State which is a member of the Organization of African Unity and a State Member of the United Nations, committed contrary to Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter. In fact, were we to accept this Zionist argument, it would be tantamount to giving an open licence to aggressively inclined countries like south Africa and Israel to invade other peace-loving countries. Consequently, this argument must be rejected by the Council *in toto*.

113. It will be recalled that up to the time of the invasion President Amin had succeeded in persuading the hijackers to release many hostages and to extend the

deadline. He was still doing his best to get all the hostages released, but Israel took the law into its own hands and decided to invade Uganda.

114. The last argument used by Israel to sway the Council was that Uganda failed, or showed no willingness, to preserve the lives and property of the hostages who were then on Ugandan soil. In other words, Israel made considerable efforts to show that Uganda failed to protect the lives and property of the foreigners. The Council has been informed that the hijacking appears to have taken place with the prior knowledge of the Ugandan Government. It has also been alleged by the Zionist representative that my President was a party to, or connived at, the hijacking of the French airbus, and many facts were quoted by him as proof of this.

115. I shall begin by quoting from the French representative's statement of last Friday. This is what he said:

"As we are aware, this affair started with the hijacking on 27 June, over Corfu, of an Air France airbus which was flying from Tel Aviv to Paris with 250 passengers on board.

"The French authorities, when informed of this hijacking, alerted some of their embassies, including that in Kampala, asking them to take steps for the plane to be given permission to land, since it was soon going to run out of fuel. That is why our Ambassador in Kampala approached the Ugandan authorities about this, and permission to land was given immediately.

"The airbus landed at Entebbe on 28 June at 3.40 p.m. The French Ambassador went to the airport, but he was unable to establish direct contact either with the hijackers or with the crew and the passengers. Marshal Idi Amin also went to the airport." [*Ibid.*, paras. 181 to 183.]

116. Let me also perhaps repeat what I said on Friday and the consistent view of my Government, namely, that Uganda does not condone terrorism. Uganda did not supply any weapons to the hijackers, as alleged by the Israeli representative. As proof of this, one need not go further than the *Newsweek* issue of 12 July where, among other things, it is said:

"The hijacked plane, Air France flight 139, originated in Tel Aviv and was en route to Paris. It made its scheduled stop in Athens, and among the boarding passengers were a pair of Arab youths carrying a large tin labelled 'stuffed dates', which may have contained weapons or explosives. The twin-jet airbus lifted off and soon a grimly familiar scenario began. Michel Marius Henry, an 84-year-old Frenchman travelling first class, said two men suddenly rose from nearby seats, pulled revolvers and announced in English: 'We are revolutionaries

and this airplane is now our property. We are going to take you where we please.' Other hijackers armed with pistols, hand grenades and stubby machine-guns ordered the passengers to put up their hands. The apparent leader, a thin, elegantly dressed man who appeared to be European, picked up the public-address microphone in the cockpit and announced: 'We are Palestinians.' "

117. The Israeli representative took a simplistic view of the complexity of the hijacking at Entebbe. The problem of negotiating with hijackers is a highly delicate one. Can the representative of Israel inform the Council how many people lost their lives at Lod Airport? Has the Council forgotten the incident at Khartoum or the Vienna incident which involved the Ministers of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries? The efforts of President Amin at Entebbe should be looked at against that background. The situation was dangerous and needed very careful handling. We in Uganda took a serious view of the matter and adopted a pragmatic approach to a problem of this nature, and that is why our President decided to negotiate with the hijackers for the release of the hostages.

118. The Israeli invasion of Uganda should also be looked at in a wider context, in that South Africa in the south of Africa and Israel in the north are trying to form an axis of power to intimidate and control Africa. This danger is further reinforced by a statement which was made by General Gur that, even if Kenya had refused to allow the Zionist airplane landing facilities, they would have landed there by force.

119. As I said at the beginning of my first statement, this Council was convened in order to consider the act of aggression committed by Zionist Israel against Uganda. The Israeli representative, however, desperately tried to divert the Council's attention from this point by launching wild and completely false allegations against my country and my President. This of course is part and parcel of world-wide Zionist and imperialist propaganda meant to cover up the Israeli cowardly act of aggression against Uganda.

120. I wish once more to call upon the Council unreservedly to condemn in the strongest possible terms Israel's barbaric, unprovoked and unwarranted aggression against the sovereign Republic of Uganda. Uganda demands from Israel full compensation for the damage to life and property caused during the Israeli invasion. Our authorities are in the process of working out the particulars of the claim arising out of the damage.

121. My country and my President have been badly attacked by the representatives of Israel and the United States. I wish once again to exercise the right of reply to the false allegations made in the Council by those representatives.

122. The representative of the United States referred to my country during his statement [1941st meeting]. He did not only echo the Zionist representative's false allegations to the effect that Uganda was an accomplice in the hijacking of the French airbus but he even told the Council how electrified he had been by the naked act of aggression committed by Israel against Uganda—an African country and a member of the Organization of African Unity and a State Member of the United Nations.

123. Such utterances on the part of the representative of the United States cannot in any way surprise us. I say this because the whole world is only too well aware of the amount of control the Zionists exercise in the United States right from the top to the bottom. We know very well the influence Zionist Israel wields in the decision-making bodies of the United States. This is what the American Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Brown, was reported to have said not long ago:

"It's so strong you wouldn't believe it. We have the Israelis coming to us for equipment. We say we can't possibly get the Congress to support a programme like that. They say 'Don't worry about the Congress. We'll take care of the Congress.'

"Now, this is somebody from another country but they can do it. They own, you know, the banks in this country, the newspapers. You just look at where the Jewish money is in this country."

124. Can one, therefore, be surprised to hear the representative of the United States applauding an act of aggression committed by Israel against the innocent people of Uganda, whose only crime—if it can be called a crime—was to have allowed an aircraft which had only 15 minutes of fuel left to land at Entebbe, thus saving the lives of more than 250 people? I leave it to the wisdom of the members of the Council to draw the necessary conclusion.

125. But I must say that sooner or later the people of the United States, who, I am sure, are not happy with the ever-increasing control by the Zionists over their affairs, will put an end to that control by the Zionists, just as we did in Uganda when we expelled the Zionist exploiters who were milking the economy of our country, to the tune of not less than 3 million shillings a day at the time they were expelled. I only want to sound a sincere warning to the United States representative here that if the United States is not very careful, Zionism will one day land the United States in troubles from which it may never be able to extricate itself.

126. I should now like to quote the following from the statement made here by the United States representative:

"To my African friends here and elsewhere I must say that on the issue of the liberation of southern

Africa my Government has put itself squarely on the side of those who seek majority rule, with the determination that it be achieved by peaceful means. I am very happy that that policy has been adopted while I have been here." [Ibid., para. 90.]

127. That is the height of hypocrisy, for how can they claim to support African majority rule in Southern Africa while at the same time they are opposed to the use of force by the African liberation movements fighting to liberate their motherland? Mr. Scranton should have known better; he should have known that Africa and African freedom-fighters did not have recourse to armed struggle until it became clear that that was the last resort, since the racist régimes in that part of Africa have adamantly refused to hand over power to the majority by peaceful means.

128. I ask again: how can the United States representative claim that the United States supports Africa when, at the same time, these are the people who are pouring money into the hands of racists in South Africa by way of investments, thus helping those racists to perpetuate their *apartheid* régime? How can the United States claim that it supports Africa when these are the very people who are opposed to the liberation forces in Africa, as demonstrated by the role they played in Angola, where one of their mercenaries has rightfully been executed?

129. The Zionist representative spoke at great length and charged my President with complicity in the hijacking episode at Entebbe. I want once again to reject categorically all his allegations as total nonsense, rubbish and a pack of lies. Uganda allowed the French aircraft to land at Entebbe on purely humanitarian grounds and after having been requested to do so by the Government of France. What would have happened to the 250 passengers of the French airbus had Uganda said "No" to the request to land at Entebbe? What would have been the situation today? Therefore, the allegations made by the Zionist representative in the Council are the worst kind of cynicism the Council has ever heard. You save somebody's life and then he turns up to kill you and the members of your family, alleging that you wanted to kill him!

130. But why has Israel embarked on a character assassination campaign against Uganda and its President? Why have the imperialists and their agents, through their mass media, resorted to this smear campaign? The reason for this is clear and simple.

131. First of all, the Zionists were caught red-handed in an act of flagrant violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Republic of Uganda. Their hands are stained and will always remain stained with the blood of those innocent Ugandan soldiers they murdered in cold blood at Entebbe Airport. The reason for the Israeli aggression is, among other things, that Uganda played and continues to play a

leading role in unmasking the ugly face of Zionism. The reason, once again, is that Uganda expelled the Zionist exploiters from its soil because of their wanton exploitation of its economy, whereby they were taking away every day more than 3 million shillings. It is also because Uganda played an important role in the breaking off of diplomatic relations between Israel and virtually all the African countries in sympathy and solidarity with the just cause of the Arab people and the Palestinians, whose lands are still under the illegal occupation of the Zionists. It is also because Uganda has denounced and will continue to denounce the Pretoria-Tel Aviv axis, which was so manifest during the October war and which has now become even more evident after the Rabin-Vorster talks and the Vorster-Kissinger talks.

132. The Zionist representative arrogantly spoke of the "respect" his country has for Africa, and also of the relations between Uganda and its neighbours. Let me say this. The Israeli attempts to divide Africa are doomed to failure. They are doomed to failure because Africa is mature enough and master of itself. The Africans know who their enemies are. Africa will not be divided, either by Zionists or by the American warships and war aircraft now at the port of Mombasa. The presence of those warships and military aircraft in that part of Africa constitutes a direct threat to international peace and security as well as to the independence of the entire African continent, and, as such, it must be condemned in the strongest possible terms.

133. I want to say that American imperialism, having been squarely defeated by the heroic peoples of Viet Nam, Cambodia and Laos, is now turning its ugly head towards Africa. But let me assure the Council that American imperialism is also doomed to suffer in Africa the same defeat it suffered in Indo-China. This is clearly illustrated by its defeat most recently in Angola.

134. As to the relations between Uganda and its neighbours, I will only say that any misunderstanding between us must be viewed as a family problem and as temporary in character, and I am confident that whatever problems there may be will be sorted out and solved in the African way, and that the imperialists will be kicked out.

135. May I remind the Zionist representative that we in Uganda are proud of having put the economy of Uganda in the hands of indigenous Ugandans, but may I also remind him that when we did so, we undertook to pay compensation to all those affected. Compensation has already been paid so far to those from India and the United States; and, for the information of everyone, I wish to say that negotiations are still under way as far as the British Asians are concerned. Zionist Israel should not therefore try to confuse us by equating the right of the people to control their own economy with racism.

136. That is the reason why I have told the Council that what the representative of Israel told us here was nothing other than a pack of lies calculated to divert the attention of the members of the Council from the real and only issue before it—namely, the Israeli act of aggression against the people of Uganda, which constituted a flagrant violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Uganda.

137. I reserve my right to reply if the need arises.

138. The PRESIDENT: Before calling on the next, and perhaps last, speaker in this debate, I should like to add a few words as the representative of ITALY to the answer I gave previously to the representative of the Soviet Union.

139. From a preliminary inquiry I made on the basis of the description of events he himself gave, I assume that he was referring to the hijacked Soviet aircraft that landed years ago in Turkey. What happened during those years and afterwards, I do not know officially. It certainly did not, and does not, involve any responsibility on the part of the Italian authorities. It seems to me, in any event, that this case further demonstrates the need for an international convention imposing strict obligations on States to prosecute hijackers and not allow them to travel freely in the world—at least not before they have been brought to justice by the country where they were captured. By the way, I believe that that is what happened to the hijackers captured by the Turkish authorities who condemned them to spend a period in jail, in accordance with their criminal law.

140. I now call on the representative of Israel.

141. Mr. HERZOG (Israel): Mr. President, at what may obviously be the conclusion of these proceedings, may I appeal to you and to the members of the Council, and above all to my African colleagues, to take action as a matter of humanity to discover the whereabouts of Mrs. Dora Bloch. If, unhappily, as I suspect, she is not alive and has been murdered, may I appeal for the body of this old lady, aged 75, to be returned to her family for decent burial. I cannot believe that this appeal of mine to the Council will go unanswered.

142. The PRESIDENT: If I may be allowed, in the light of the whole debate, to interpret the sentiment of the members of the Council on this particular humanitarian case, I would convey this appeal to the Foreign Minister of Uganda.

143. I have no further names on my list of speakers. I would assume, therefore, that we have concluded our debate, and if no other representative wishes to take the floor at this stage, in accordance with the normal procedures and well-established practice, I shall take it that the Council is ready to proceed to a vote on the two draft resolutions before the Council which are contained in documents S/12138 and S/12139 respectively.

144. Mr. SALIM (United Republic of Tanzania): Mr. President, before we proceed to the voting stage, I should like to take the floor on behalf of my African colleagues, the delegations of Benin and the Libyan Arab Republic, with respect to the conduct of the voting on our own draft resolution [S/12139].

145. In both of the interventions that I have made before the Council, I have emphasized Africa's concern as clearly reflected by the African spokesman in the Council, my brother from Libya and my brother from Benin, and also—and above all—by the Chairman of the twenty-seventh regular session of the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity, my brother, the Foreign Minister of Mauritius, as well as by a number of other African delegations not members of this Council that have taken the floor to express the unanimous feeling and the unanimous concern of the Organization of African Unity and its member States with respect to the violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Republic of Uganda.

146. I myself had stated, in both my interventions, that we would have preferred this debate to take place without excessive emotionalism in order to give an opportunity to all our colleagues to treat the complaint submitted to the Council by the African States on its own merits—to enable them to pronounce themselves on the merits of this particular complaint, which concerns the violation of the sovereignty of one of our members. Unfortunately, this has not been possible. We have seen, as evidenced in the draft resolution introduced by the representative of the United Kingdom on behalf of both his delegation and the delegation of the United States of America [S/12138], an attempt to gloss over completely the fact of the violation of Uganda's sovereignty.

147. I shall, of course, have occasion to explain my delegation's vote on this draft resolution before proceeding to the vote, but for the time being, referring to our own draft resolution, we find that, in view of all these circumstances and in view of the confrontations which have been exhibited and in view of the fact there seems to be a determination to ignore completely, or at least to gloss over, Africa's legitimate complaint, it would not be ideal for us to press our draft resolution to a vote.

148. Accordingly, on behalf of the sponsors of this draft resolution, we do not insist that it be voted on. However, we would like to make it clear that this draft remains in the records of the Council and that the African States reserve their option to renew at an appropriate moment the discussion of this important problem within the context of the underlying principle for which we are fighting in this particular situation. That is all that I have to say on behalf of my colleagues—Benin and the Libyan Arab Republic—and of the delegation of Tanzania in respect of the draft resolution which we have sponsored. We shall, as

I have said, explain our vote on the United Kingdom-United States draft resolution.

149. The PRESIDENT: I wish to assure the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania that I have carefully noted what he has said on behalf of his delegation and of the delegations of the other African members of the Council.

150. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the voting.

151. Mr. MIRZA (Pakistan): In my statement of 12 July [1941st meeting], I said that in the view of my delegation the issue before the Council was aggression by Israel against Uganda and that the Council could pronounce itself only in one way—that is, by upholding the principle of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States and condemning the act of aggression by Israel against Uganda. Further, I had added that the Council should demand that compensation for the great loss of life and property caused by the Israeli action be paid to Uganda. We were gratified to see that, but for a very small number of speakers, all participants in the debate shared these views, which are based on facts and respect for the principles of the Charter, international law and international morality.

152. In our view, the draft resolution presented by Benin, the Libyan Arab Republic and the United Republic of Tanzania, which is not being pressed to a vote, is a response to the general wishes and deals adequately with the issues before us. It is moderate in its language, and the action proposed by it is the minimum which the situation demands. We support it now and will support it later whenever this matter is again considered by the Council.

153. In our statement on 12 July, we also expressed our readiness to discuss the evil of terrorism at any time and in any forum. I reiterate that we in Pakistan have never condoned or supported acts of terrorism, including hijacking. Further, we have said that we should not be selective in defining terrorism and that it should be discussed in its entirety and in all its aspects.

154. As regards the draft resolution on hijacking presented by the delegations of the United Kingdom and of the United States, we note with regret that it does not deal with the subject before us. We also note, in particular, the fact that in its operative paragraph 3 the draft merely reaffirms the need to respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all States, without any reference to the Israeli violation of Uganda's sovereignty and territorial integrity in contravention of the provisions of the Charter.

155. As I said a while ago, my country and Government are opposed to and deplore hijacking. However, as this draft resolution, in its substance and thrust, is

not really related to the subject that we are discussing, the delegation of Pakistan regrets to state that it will not be able to participate in the vote on that draft resolution.

156. Mr. HAYNES (Guyana): On behalf of the delegation of Guyana, I wish to make just a brief observation concerning the draft resolution in document S/12138, which is to be put to the vote.

157. The subject matter of that draft resolution—the problem of hijacking—is not on the agenda of this meeting of the Council. What is really before us is the complaint of the current Chairman of the Organization of African Unity, the Prime Minister of Mauritius, concerning the act of aggression of Israel against the Republic of Uganda. Of course, as we have already pointed out:

“Those who seek to misconstrue the implications of the issue with which we are faced today—that is, the aggression of Israel against Uganda—only render more difficult the global search by the international community through the General Assembly for a solution to the phenomenon of international terrorism. Guyana, for its part, remains ready to make its contribution to that ongoing search at the appropriate time and in the appropriate forum.”
[1940th meeting, para. 87.]

158. For the reason I have outlined, my delegation will not be participating in the vote on this draft resolution.

159. Mr. BOYA (Benin) (*interpretation from French*): In our previous statement [1941st meeting] my delegation already said that the item on our agenda is the act of aggression committed by Israel against Uganda. Regardless of the importance and urgency of the problem of international terrorism and aerial piracy mentioned in draft resolution S/12138, my delegation feels that that draft does not deal with the agenda item. We therefore regret that we shall not be able to participate in the vote.

160. Mr. KHARLAMOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): The sponsors of the three-Power draft resolution contained in document S/12139 have withdrawn their proposal, and it was precisely that draft which we viewed as a proper foundation for a decision on the question being considered by the Council.

161. The two-Power draft resolution in document S/12138 would actually compel us to alter the agenda item and to take up another issue which, though important, is not included in the Council's agenda. We have stated our position on two occasions. We shall not be able to participate in the vote on this draft resolution.

162. The PRESIDENT: The Council will now vote on the draft resolution sponsored by the United King-

dom and the United States contained in document S/12138.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: France, Italy, Japan, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Panama, Romania.

The result of the vote was 6 votes in favour, none against and 2 abstentions.

The draft resolution was not adopted, having failed to obtain the affirmative votes of nine members.

Seven members (Benin, China, Guyana, the Libyan Arab Republic, Pakistan, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United Republic of Tanzania) did not participate in the voting.

163. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call upon those representatives who wish to explain their votes after the voting.

164. Mr. RICHARD (United Kingdom): Mr. President, I am grateful to you for allowing me to speak in explanation of vote and also in response to what I may, if he will forgive me, describe as the very dignified statement made by my colleague and friend the representative of Tanzania.

165. Before I explain my delegation's vote I should like to associate myself with the representative of France in expressing my deep regret at the death of Mr. Heinemann, the former President of the Federal Republic of Germany. My country, which has such close and friendly relations with the Federal Republic, is particularly saddened at the death of a wise and distinguished statesman who fought so hard in his lifetime for democracy, truth and human decency.

166. Turning now to the draft resolution in document S/12138, which we have just not adopted, I would observe that in the first preambular paragraph of that draft no reference is made to the communication from the Prime Minister of Mauritius, the current Chairman of the Organization of African Unity. I would only say that it was a sin of omission, not a sin of commission, and had the draft proceeded in a normal manner it might have been necessary for us at some stage to propose the appropriate amendments. I hope the Foreign Minister of Mauritius will accept my apology for not having included a reference to his communication in the body of the draft resolution which has unfortunately not been adopted by the Council.

167. This has been a long, difficult and, at times, emotional debate. I do not think that is necessarily

such a bad thing. Indeed, it was perhaps almost inevitable. What we are dealing with here are important and complex issues which mean a great deal to all of us and which have important implications for the conduct of international relations. I think it is only right, therefore, that we should have used this occasion to speak our minds freely and frankly, and, in spite of the fact that we have not been able to reach agreement, I believe that a great many of the concerns that have been expressed during the debate are in fact widely shared.

168. It seems to me that certain common strands run through the majority of the statements that have been made in the debate.

169. First, I think that almost all of us, if not all of those who have spoken, have made clear their condemnation of hijacking and international terrorism and that there is in the Council general acceptance of the need for further international action to be taken, if not now, at least at the earliest appropriate moment, to prevent further acts of hijacking and to punish those responsible. We have noted with great interest this unanimity of approach, and we will wish to consider very carefully what should now be done. In this context I should particularly like to draw the Council's attention to the statement on this subject made by the Heads of Government of the member States of the European Council at their meeting in Brussels on 12 and 13 July.

170. The second point to which I would attach special importance is the concern that has been expressed around this table for the need to uphold the rule of law and the Charter of the United Nations and to ensure respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all States. My Government fully understands the concern that has been expressed on many sides for the implications of the Israeli action at Entebbe in respect of those principles.

171. The third point to which I should like to draw attention, and which has, I think, been at the root of the present debate, is the question of how to reconcile the duty, which a State undoubtedly has, to protect the lives of its citizens with the need to respect the principles I have just enumerated.

172. Fourthly, perhaps I could add a further point about which I am sure there is no dispute. We all very much regret the loss of life to which these events have led, whether those involved were black or white. One of the reasons why Mrs. Bloch played such a large part in this debate is simple. It is not that she was white, nor only that the whole world has been appalled at the apparent fate of a 75-year-old sick woman. It is that the Government of Uganda chose to lie about her.

173. May I also—and I am glad the Foreign Minister of Uganda is here to listen to what I have to say, at least I hope he is—assure the Foreign Minister of

Uganda that the Government and people of the United Kingdom are not prepared to submit to threats from whatever quarter those threats may come. You can persuade the British to do a great deal, but blackmail will not work.

174. There can, I think, be little doubt that these are difficult questions. They will be the subject of much debate in the future, and we should certainly not try to shirk them. But it was precisely because of the difficulty of reaching agreement in the Council on issues such as these within the course of a debate such as that which we have been holding this week that, in my statement of 12 July [1940th meeting], I suggested that the Council would do well to concentrate its attention not on seeking to pass a judgement on what had taken place but instead on looking to the avoidance of such events in the future. It was for that reason that my delegation, together with the United States delegation, put forward the draft resolution condemning the hijacking of the Air France jetliner, deploring the loss of life resulting from it, reaffirming the need to respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all States in accordance with the United Nations Charter and calling for the consideration by the international community of ways to assure the future safety and reliability of international civil aviation.

175. In view of the very wide agreement that has been expressed within the Council with each of those four main points, we very much regret that it has not been possible to secure agreement on the adoption of this draft resolution today.

176. We are, however, very grateful not only to those delegations who voted in favour of it, but also to those delegations who, for one reason or another, not feeling able to participate in the vote, nevertheless expressed themselves in agreement with the terms of the draft resolution. Our sponsorship of that draft resolution does most certainly not imply any hostility on the part of my Government towards any other State or States, nor should it be thought to evidence any lack of sympathy on our part for their preoccupations or their interests. Our interest in this was to promote what we regarded as a balanced and an equitable draft covering all aspects of the events at Entebbe in a way which we hoped would lay the groundwork for future international co-operative action to deal with the scourge of terrorism.

177. My delegation regrets that the Council should have been unable to reach an agreed outcome. Nevertheless, we feel that the discussions here have served a purpose in bringing out and identifying, perhaps highlighting, some of the important issues that are involved, and contributing to a greater understanding of them. Although, therefore, it has not been possible to agree on action today, we hope that this debate will serve as a stimulus to further international discussion, particularly on the subject of hijacking, and that at

some time in the near future we shall be able to agree on action in the United Nations which, we hope, will prevent future acts of hijacking and rid the world of this terror by night which threatens the fabric of our societies, which endangers confidence among States and which places at risk the lives of the innocent.

178. Mr. ABE (Japan): I should like to explain briefly the vote my delegation cast on the draft resolution introduced by the representative of the United Kingdom on behalf of the delegations of the United States and his own country, which is contained in document S/12138. My delegation voted in favour of it. We wish to state, however, that in our view, the Israeli military action, *prima facie*, constituted a violation of the sovereignty of Uganda, which we very much deplore. We feel that the draft would have been much better if this point had been taken care of in it. None the less, my delegation, which is firmly opposed to hijacking and all other acts of international terrorism, could subscribe to all the elements contained in that draft resolution and therefore voted in favour of it.

179. Mr. BENNETT (United States of America): Before making a few concluding remarks, I should like to join others in expressing to the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany my condolences on the death of President Heinemann, a man for whom we had great respect in my country and who represented a country with which the United States has close and enduring ties.

180. I should like to make several observations on the conduct and substance of the debate which we are now concluding.

181. The United States very much regrets that the Council did not take positive action against the criminal act of hijacking committed the week before last against the Air France aircraft and its passengers. We believe that the draft resolution that we co-sponsored with the United Kingdom was a balanced attempt at recording the Council's determined opposition to hijacking as well as its respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States and its concern for the loss of human life in this tragic incident. We take considerable satisfaction in the fact that, with a majority of the membership participating in the vote, not a single delegation could bring itself to vote against such a balanced draft resolution.

182. We deeply regret the deaths of those on all sides in this controversy, those who had no responsibility for the act of terrorism which gave rise to the subsequent events. We extend our sincere condolences once again to all the families concerned, and particularly to the family of Mrs. Dora Bloch.

183. We are most sensitive to the major point stressed by our colleagues from Africa during this debate: that the sovereignty and the territorial integrity of States must be sustained and protected. This is a natural and

fundamental standard to which my Government fully adheres. As my country reviews its history in the year 1976, we particularly recall our own keen concern with this principle from the very outset of our life as a nation. We do not, however, view the exceptional nature of the incident at Entebbe as unjustified under international law. At the same time, we do not see it as a precedent which would justify any future unauthorized entry into another State's territory that is not similarly justified by exceptional circumstances.

184. This debate has provided, in our view, a valuable opportunity to air the entire question of hijacking and the issues surrounding the Israeli operation at Entebbe. The debate has heightened public and governmental awareness of the real threat which air hijacking poses to the world today. The Council has provided a unique forum for a full discussion of what actually happened at Entebbe and the antecedent cause of that incident. One lesson that has emerged clearly for all of us in this debate: we have had impressed upon us the terrible toll of human life and property taken by hijacking and the use of innocent people as hostages.

185. My delegation has been encouraged by several statements made during this debate by Members of the United Nations who have stated their intention to press for action by this Organization against hijacking. In particular, we applaud the statement made by the representative by the Federal Republic of Germany [1941st meeting], who announced that his Government will urge action at the thirty-first session of the General Assembly for international measures to prevent the taking of hostages. My Government will strongly support the efforts of the Federal Republic of Germany and we shall work closely with them and with others to encourage all Members of the United Nations to support a convention to that end. We are pleased to note, in that connexion, that the representative of the Soviet Union, speaking in the Council on 13 July, said: "We are ready, along with other States, to take new additional measures against acts of international terrorism" [1942nd meeting, para. 189]. The sooner all the member nations of this body formally recognize that hijacking is a world-wide problem, the sooner we take positive steps to do away with this plague of international lawlessness, the safer life will be for ourselves and our children.

186. Mr. SALIM (United Republic of Tanzania): I shall be very brief.

187. I wish first to associate the delegation of Tanzania with the profound condolences extended to the delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany at the most untimely passing away of Mr. Gustav Heinemann, the former President of that country. We would request the delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany to be kind enough to convey to the Government and the people of the Federal Republic of Germany our profound sense of loss.

188. Secondly, I just wanted to explain the Tanzanian delegation's position as briefly as possible. We did not take part in the vote on the draft resolution sponsored by the delegations of the United Kingdom and the United States for reasons which I explained earlier this afternoon in my previous statement. We consider that this draft resolution is not one which should really have been introduced in the context of the discussion in which the Council is now engaged. In taking up the position which has now long been established by our colleagues from the People's Republic of China of not participating in the vote, we did so because we felt that it would not have been proper for our delegation either to abstain or to vote against the draft resolution as, by doing so, we would have been expressing our position on the merits of that draft resolution, and we do not think that this is the time, nor do the circumstances permit us to do so.

189. Lastly, there is much in the draft resolution that we find is not objectionable, and we think it would have been unfair for us to express our position without going into a proper scrutiny of the text.

190. One final observation: I do not subscribe to the views expressed by our colleagues from the United Kingdom and the United States that this draft resolution is a balanced one.

191. The PRESIDENT: There is no other delegation wishing to speak in explanation of vote. The voting procedure has therefore come to an end.

192. There is one last speaker, the Foreign Minister of Mauritius, on whom I now call.

193. Sir Harold WALTER (Mauritius): I should like at the outset to convey to the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany my Government's condolences on the sad bereavement of which we all know.

194. I should also like to express my congratulations to the Government and the people of France on their *fête nationale*. It is amazing that on 4 July the Assembly of Heads of State was seized in the early hours of the morning of what happened in Uganda and that on 4 July it was the great American day. And how strange the coincidence that on 14 July we should be finishing with the debate on this sad and tragic affair.

195. Mr. President, I should like, on behalf of the Organization of African Unity, to thank you for having

convened the Council and for having given it a very healthy exercise in giving free vent to feelings on an unprecedented situation, where stress has been laid on the causes and the effects of what took place in Uganda. I hope that the debates on this subject will prove useful for future guidance and that no one who has been listening to these debates, which at times have been acrimonious but which most of the time have been very serious, will forget the stress and the emphasis that all the members of the Council and those who spoke have laid on the sacred principles enshrined in the Charter.

196. It is fitting also to mention that the decision to convene the Council on this issue was taken by Assembly of the Heads of State of the Organization of African Unity at the Mahatma Gandhi Institute in Mauritius—an institution which bears the name of that great peace lover. And I think that it is appropriate that I should quote one of his sayings—"Truth, standing alone, will triumph".

197. How can we forget—however temporary it was—the violation of the territorial integrity of a sister State of the United Nations?

198. I should like here, in conclusion, to quote for the meditation of my colleagues the words of Wendell Phillips, and I hope that their substance and the spirit which inspired him when he wrote them will linger for a long time in the minds of those who are powerful enough to say that might is right:

"To the human and the humane there is always a spirit of understanding. What is gained by force is half gained; what is gained by argument is gained forever."

199. I am grateful to the representative of the United Kingdom for his belated effort to repair an omission. May I say, being British educated, how British this statement is: to be wise after the event!

The meeting rose at 7.40 p.m.

Notes

¹ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 860, p. 105.

² *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-seventh Session, Sixth Committee*, 1369th meeting, para. 28. (The official records of the Sixth Committee are issued in summary form.)

³ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 704, p. 219.

⁴ *Ibid.*, vol. 974, p. 177.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة
يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودرر التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم. استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف.

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.
